<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-40 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 9, 14, 22, 24-26, 31, 32 and 40 have been amended as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. Claims 23 and 39 have been canceled.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   **Rejection of Claims 1, 9, 14, 22, 25, 26, 31, 32 and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 1, 9, 14, 22, 25, 26, 31, 32 and 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants' representative respectively disagrees. Independent claims 1, 9, 14, 22, 25, 26, 31, 32 and 40 have been amended herein to clearly illustrate that elements within such claims are components associated with a computer. In particular, claim 1 as amended is directed towards a full-text search *computer implemented* system, comprising a plug-in component and a search component, wherein the *plug-in component and search component* perform a function (*e.g.,* define a relevant score algorithm and utilize the plug-in component to query data and generate a list of matching documents). (Support for these amendments can be found on pg. 6, lines 11-18 and pg. 7, lines 3-30). Accordingly, this claim includes functional descriptive material within a computer, thereby rendering it structurally and functionally interrelated to the computer and is therefore directed to statutory subject matter.

> Because the claimed process applies the Boolean principle [abstract idea] *to produce a useful, concrete, tangible result* … on its face the claimed process comfortably falls within the scope of §101. *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.,* 172 F.3d 1352, 1358. (Fed.Cir. 1999) (Emphasis added); *See State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Fin. Group, Inc.,* 149 F.3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601 (Fed.Cir.1998).

Furthermore, claims 9, 14, 22, 25, 26, 31, 32 and 40 have been similarly amended. Thus, it is readily apparent that these claims, as well as independent claim 1, recite independent acts to produce a useful, tangible, and concrete result. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claims 9-13 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Basso, *et al.* (US 7,054,855 B2) hereinafter Basso. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Basso *et al.* does not teach or suggest all the features of the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*** set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ***The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim***. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed subject matter teaches a full-text search system that can employ separately provided index schemas and ranking algorithms to efficiently generate relevant results for targeted domains. To this end independent claim 9 recites *a full-text indexing computer implemented system comprising a gatherer component to retrieve a document from a data store,* ***a producer pipeline component that parses the structure and text of the retrieved document in accordance with a plurality of third party developer specified components*** *and a consumer pipeline component that receives data from the producer pipeline component and persists data to an inverted index, upon receipt of data, the consumer pipeline component consumes the data and takes action via executing a message through transacted message queues.* Basso *et al.* is silent about such novel aspects of the subject claims.

Basso *et al.* teaches a system for performing a pattern match search for a data string having a plurality of characters separated by delimiters. However, the cited reference is silent regarding full-text searching of documents and also does not disclose utilizing third party developer plug-ins components. At the cited portions, the cited document provides a technique for processing URI character strings. The URL address string is parsed into data string elements wherein a data string element is a sequence of characters between a pair of pre-designated delimiters. A search key constructed from the data string element is utilized to index into a direct table and a leaf table within a storage device via a fixed match search pipeline. The URI character string in the cited document is parsed into data string elements in accordance with a pattern that is system pre-defined, and not in accordance with a third party specified component.

Thus, the cited document does not teach *a producer pipeline component that parses the structure and text of the retrieved document **in accordance with a plurality of third party developer specified components*** as recited by independent claim 9 of applicants' claimed subject matter. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claim 9 (and the claims that depend from) should be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 14-40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 14-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaev, *et al.* (US 5,802,518) and Meyerzon, *et al.* (US 6,199,081 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Karaev *et al.* and Meyerzon *et al.* alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the features of the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must show an
> unrebutted *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of
> obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First,
> there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references
> themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary
> skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference
> teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.
> Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach
> or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching
> or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable
> expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based
> on applicants' disclosure. *See In re Vaeck,* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d
> 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed subject matter teaches a full-text search system that can employ separately provided index schemas and ranking algorithms to efficiently generate relevant results for targeted domains. To this end independent claim 1 recites *a full-text search computer implemented system comprising **a plug-in component that defines a relevant score algorithm and a search component adapted to receive and utilize the plug-in component to query data and generate a list of matching documents***. Independent claims 14, 22, 26 and 32 recite similar limitations. Karaev *et al.* and Meyerzon *et al.*, do not teach or suggest all the features recited in the subject claims.

Karaev *et al.* teaches an electronic information distribution system that allows remote users to receive, access and query information that is stored at a central server. A customized

view of the information thus accessed is provided to the user. At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Karaev *et al*. does not teach a plug-in component that defines a relevant score algorithm. The Examiner tries to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Karaev *et al*. with Meyerzon *et al*. Meyerzon *et al*. teaches a computer based system for processing data obtained from documents retrieved from a computer network during a gathering project. At the cited portions, the cited document teaches a gatherer process that gathers web documents according to the requirements of a user, then passes the data and properties information in the web document to one or more active plug-ins. The active plug-in modifies the properties in the data stream and content based on the requirements of the gatherer process. This modified document data stream is then passed to consumer plug-ins that processes the document information. The consumer plug-in component taught by the cited document is an indexing engine that creates and maintains an index. The active plug-in modifies the properties of the document according to the requirements of the query generated by the user and input into the gatherer process, and the consumer plug-in processes the document on the basis of the modified properties. Thus, it is the gatherer process that selects the plug-ins to be utilized to modify the web document in order to process the query requirements. Hence, the cited document does not teach *a plug-in component that defines a relevant score algorithm* as recited in the subject claims. By allowing a plug-in component and utilizing it to query data, the claimed subject matter enables users to define their own index structures and ranking algorithms.

In view of the above, it is apparent that Karaev *et al*. and Meyerzon *et al*. alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the features of the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection is withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP599US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Marisa J. Zink/
Marisa J. Zink
Reg. No. 48,064

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731